1	
2	
3	
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
6	***
7	ANDRE M. INGRAM,) 2:11-CV-00139-PMP-PAL
9	Plaintiff,
10	vs. ORDER
11	SKY SECURITY SERVICES, et al.,
12 13	Defendants.
14	
15	Plaintiff has failed to timely respond to Defendants' Motion for Summary
16	Judgment (Doc. #15), and therefore, under the Local Rules of this Court, consents to the
17	granting of the Motion. Moreover, a review of Defendants' Motion shows Defendant is
18	entitled to the relief requested on the merits.
19	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendants' Motion to for Summary
20	Judgment (Doc. #15) is GRANTED and that the Clerk of Court shall forthwith enter
21	judgment in favor of Defendants and against Plaintiff.
22	DATED: April 17, 2012.
23	
24	Phy m. On
25	
26	PHILIP M. PRO United States District Judge